Message

From: Beck, Nancy [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP

(FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=168ECB5184AC44DE95A913297F353745-BECK, NANCY]

Sent: 4/5/2019 5:37:46 PM

To: Jackson, Ryan [jackson.ryan@epa.gov]; Wright, Peter [wright.peter@epa.gov]

CC: Bodine, Susan [bodine.susan@epa.gov]; Lyons, Troy [lyons.troy@epa.gov]; Kramer, Jessica L.

[kramer.jessical@epa.gov]; Ross, David P [ross.davidp@epa.gov]; Bolen, Brittany [bolen.brittany@epa.gov]; Dunlap,

David [dunlap.david@epa.gov]; Doyle, Brett [doyle.brett@epa.gov]

Subject: RE: dumb question

As per statistics in the action plan, there are 602 PFAS compounds (so in the category) on the *active* inventory. 621 PFAS compounds are on the *inactive* inventory—have not been in commerce for at least the last 10 years.

Nancy B. Beck, Ph.D., DABT

Principal Deputy Assistant Administrator, OCSPP

P: 202-564-1273 beck.nancy@epa.gov

From: Jackson, Ryan

Sent: Friday, April 5, 2019 1:24 PM

To: Wright, Peter < wright.peter@epa.gov>; Beck, Nancy < Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>

Cc: Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>; Bodine, Susan <bodine.susan@epa.gov>; Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>;

Kramer, Jessica L. <kramer.jessical@epa.gov>; Ross, David P <ross.davidp@epa.gov>; Bolen, Brittany
 <bolen.brittany@epa.gov>; Dunlap, David <dunlap.david@epa.gov>; Doyle, Brett <doyle.brett@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: dumb question

Is it 500 + substances under the category of PFAS?

From: Wright, Peter

Sent: Friday, April 5, 2019 12:56 PM

To: Jackson, Ryan < jackson.ryan@epa.gov>

Cc: Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>; Bodine, Susan <bodine.susan@epa.gov>; Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>;

Kramer, Jessica L. kramer.jessical@epa.gov; Ross, David P ross.davidp@epa.gov; Bolen, Brittany bolen, Brittany@epa.gov; Doyle, Brett doyle.brett@epa.gov; Doyle, Brett doyle.brett@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: dumb question

Ryan

With my undergraduate major in religion I try to avoid answering chemistry questions. Your first scenario sounds correct and presumably could cause materials not yet created or discovered to be CERCLA hazardous substances. I do not know if there would be any controversy over whether a chemical falls into that broadly described class based on the chemical nomenclature used.

The second would cause the two targeted chemicals be immediately classified as CERCLA hazardous substances with a default reportable quantity of a release of 1 pound.

Peter

From: Jackson, Ryan

Sent: Friday, April 5, 2019 11:12 AM

To: Beck, Nancy < Beck, Nancy@epa.gov>; Bodine, Susan < bodine.susan@epa.gov>; Bolen, Brittany < bolen.brittany@epa.gov>; Doyle, Brett < doyle.brett@epa.gov>; Lyons, Troy < lyons.troy@epa.gov>; Dunlap, David < dunlap.david@epa.gov>; Ross, David P < ross.davidp@epa.gov>; Kramer, Jessica L. < kramer.jessical@epa.gov>; Wright,

Peter < wright.peter@epa.gov>

Subject: dumb question

Section 101(14) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601(14)) is amended to include all per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances

Section 101(14) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601(14)) is amended to include perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA) and perfluorooctane sulfonate (PFOS) = two targeted substances no longer in production

Right?

Ryan Jackson Chief of Staff U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (202) 564-6999